

Court
original

IN THE UNITED STATES 8TH DISTRICT COURT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE MATTER OF

APPEAL CAPTION

WRIT OF HABER FASCIAS VISUM, HABEAS CORPUS

; ARTICLE III, SEC. 2., ORIGINAL JURISDICTION ;

FOREIGN STATE IMMUNITY ACT ; FEDERAL QUESTION

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION (28 U.S.C. Sec. 1331)

PLAINTIFFS

<>

RESPONDENT

HIS MAJESTY LORD PUNCHALL

<>

HONORABLE J. G. Z.

702 WEST FIRST STREET

<>

U.S. 9TH DISTRICT COURT

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

<>

405 WEST CONGRESS STREET

(575)-694-4385/punchardwilliamlord@gmail.com

<>

TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701

ROYAL CONTINENTAL NUBIAN SUDAN GOVERNMENT

<>

ROYAL EMBASSY # 15.

<> U. S. 9TH DISTRICT COURT /

702 WEST FIRST STREET

<> RECORD PROPER

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

<> 405 W. Congress Street

(575)-694-4385/punchardwilliamlord@gmail.com

<> TUCSON, AZ, 85701

GLOBAL SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE UNION

<> (520)-205-4200

DISTRICT 1. ROYAL Nubian Sudan Embassy#15.

<>

702 WEST FIRST STREET

<>

DEMING, NM, 88030. U.S.A.,

<>

(575)-694-4385/FLATBUMP@GMAIL.COM

<>

RECEIVED

APR 06 2021

BY MAIL

1 **IN THE UNITED STATES 8th DISTRICT COURT**

2 **FOR STATE OF MISSOURI**

3 **IN THE MATTER OF**

4 **CONSPIRACY TO CRIMINAL TRESPASS ON FEDERAL CONTRACT ;**

5 **CRIMINAL EXTRA -TERRITORIAL INVASION ACT:**

6 **ROYAL CONTINENTAL NUBIAN SUDAN GOVERNMENT; HIS MAJESTY LORD**

7 **PUNCHALL, GLOBAL SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE UNION,**

8 **PLAINTIFF**

9 **Vs,**

10 **U. S. 9 th District COURT Judge JGZ ; U.S. 9TH DISTRICT COURT/ RECORD PROPER,**
11 **(U. S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT(Santa Fe, NM, Division); STATE OF NEW**
12 **MEXICO ; LUNA COUNTY COMMISSION; NEW MEXICO'S GOVERNOR MESHELL**
13 **L. GRISHAM (SUSANN MARTINES); DEMING CITY COMMISSION BOARD),**
14 **RESPONDENT.**

15 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: WRIT OF HABE'ER FA'CIAS SEISI'NAM; WRIT**
16 **OF HABEAS CORPES**

17 **COME NOW, THE PLAINTIFFS in the above named case and style moving the**
18 **HONORABLE 8TH District Court with a GOOD PROBABLE CAUSE CLASS**
19 **ACTION COMPLAINT WRIT .**

20
21 **COURTS JURISDICTION: ARTICLE III., Sec. 2., Paragraf 2.; FSIA JURISDICTION**

22 **A. THE Court has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to : The Foreign**

23 **Sovereign Immensities Act of 1976 (FSIA); violation of the 14th Amendment, Section 5.**

24 **(Attempted Property Deprivation),(Violation of Establish U.S. Court Conduct Rule against**

25 **Personal wrongful Conduct : FOREJUDGER Act); Violation of the 4th**

26 **Amendment (unreasonable Seizure of Federal Mining Lease Contracted PROPERTY); Violation**

27 **of the 5 th Amendment.**

28 **(1)**

PARTIES TO THE CASE

RESPONDENT

HONORABLE JUDGE J G. Z <> **U. S. 9TH DISTRICT COURT/ RECORD**
UNITED STATES 9TH DISTRICT COURT <> **PROPER**
405 WEST CONGRESS STREET <> **405 w. CONGRESS STREET**
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701 <> **TUCSON, AZ, 85701**
(520)-205-4200 <> **(520)-205-4200**

PLAINTIFFS

HIS MAJESTY LORD PUNCHALL
ROYAL CONTINENTAL NUBIAN SUDAN GOVERNMENT
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, U. S. A.
punchardwilliamlord@Gmail.com/(575)-694-4385

ROYAL CONTINENTAL NUBIAN SUDAN GOVERNMENT
ROYAL NUBIAN SUDAN EMBASSY #15.
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, U. S. A.
pimchardwilliamlord@Gmail.com/(575)-694-4385

GLOBAL SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE UNION
DISTRICT 1. ,ROYAL NUBIAN SUDAN EMBASSY #15.
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, U. S. A. , (575)-694-4385

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>ORIGINAL JURISDICTION</u> ...; 28 U.S.C.A, SEC. 1331 ((FSIA).....	1.
<u>JUDICIAL STATEMENTS</u>WRIT HABE'ER FA'CIAS SEISI'NAM, WRIT OF HABEAS	
CORPES DE NOVA.....	1., 2.
<u>PROBABLE CAUSE</u> , Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....	3.
<u>HISTORY</u> ...COUNT 1...(FIRST CASE STATEMENT , HISTORY).....	4. 6. 7 .
<u>HISTORY</u>COUNT 2. ...(SECOND CASE STATEMENTS).....	5.
<u>STATEMENT OF FACT</u>	5,,6
<u>CASE FACT</u>(COUNT 2).....	9.10., 11.
<u>ISSUES OF COUNT 1</u>COURT'S CLERK'S RULE.....	7, 8, 9, 10.
<u>ARGUMENTS</u>COUNT 1., COUNT 2.	12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.
<u>CONCLUSIONS</u> ,,,,,COUNT 1. COUNT 2.	17.,18.
<u>(EXHIBIT A)</u>DOCUMENT No. 29.....	5.
<u>(EXHIBIT B)</u>DOCUMENT No. 38.	6,,7. 15.
<u>(EXHIBIT C)</u>CV-98-0140 JC/RPL.....	4.
<u>(EXHIBIT E)</u>NOTICE TO "BLM".....(EXHIBIT ..1.,2.	
<u>(EXHIBIT F)</u>NOTICE TO VACATE(Deming CITY).....	4.
<u>(EXHIBIT G)</u> ...REPLY to Notice to Vacate by(Luna County).....	4.
<u>(EXHIBIT i)</u> .. U.S. 9 th APPEALS REFUSAL TO VOTE.....	1.
<u>(EXHIBIT P.1)</u>UTILITY PROFF BILL BY City.....	2, 17.
<u>(EXHIBIT p.2)</u>UTILITY Recipt...by City.....	1. 7
<u>(EXHIBIT P.3)</u>OVER CHARGE ,,by City,,,	1.7

AUTHORITIES

28 U. S. C. A. Sec. 1331, Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....	1, 2, 3.5.11.
28 U. S. C. A. 455 (B),(1) Disqualification Rule,.....	12.
28 U. S. C. A. 455(a), Appearance of Bias.	2.,4. 3.7.10.
<u>U. S. Vs, Belmont Bank, 301 U. S. 324(1937)</u>	4, 5.3.7.10.
U. S. Vs, CUSTISS CORP. 299 U.S. 304(1936).....	14.
1 ST AMENDMENT.....	16
U,S, 1983 CODE.....	2
U. S. 1872 MINING ACT.....	7.13.
<u>1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT</u>	2.
1983 CODE.....	2.
CRIMINAL EXTRA TERRITORIAL INVASION ACT.....	1.2.12.13.15.17.
INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.....	13. 15..
EXTRA-CIRCUMSTANCES.....	3.
FSIA.....	1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18.

CONSTITUTIONAL

45 CFR Sec, 681.10(d).....	2.3.4.5.15,18.
45 CFR Sec, 681.10(F).....	3,4,5,7,8.9,10,14,17.
ARTICLE III, Sec. 2. PARG. 2.	1, 5, 14, 15, 18..
ARTICLE I, Sec. 10. Reprisals / CITY.....	2, 15, 18.
4TH. .AMENDED.....	1.8, 11.
5TH AMENDMENT.....	1.
14TH AMENDMENT.....	1, 6, 9,11,
5th Amendment.....	1.
U.S, LOGAN ACT.....	6,
6th Amendment.....	2.3.11.4.18.

(IV)

Amendment (unreasonable Seizure of Federal Mining Lease Contracted PROPERTY);
 Violation of the 5 th Amendment, (FAILURE TO DUE process),(and Attempted to aid a
 Double Jeopardy) ,(Attempting TO AID Criminal Extra Territorial Invasion by a
EMINENT DOMAING of a Foreign International Trade Zone), (Criminal Trespass to
 Chattel); VIOLATION of Article I, Section 10 (Reprisals); Violation of the 1964
Civil Right Act (State DISCRIMINATION ON Origin) ; Violating the Conduct 1983
Code By County; 28 U.S.C.A.1331,Subject Matter Jurisdiction Violating of 28_
U.S.C.A. 455 (A) Appearance of Bias; Attempting a Political Exercised Counter
 Claim (28 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1331) Mandate ; Willfully attempted Malicious
 Prosecution ; 6 th Amendment, (failure to Court Certify **Political Counter -Claims**
 subject Matter Jurisdiction), (Bias Suaponde Attempting to Hi-Jack a Defaulted
Case Position ,45 CFR SEC. 681.10 (d)); _ This court has Jurisdiction.

JUDICIAL STATEMENT

THIS IS A Foreign Relations Contract CASE HAVING WRIT OF HABER FASCIAS
 VISUM ; HABEAS CORPUS - DE NOVA -

REDRESS PETITION (EX POST FACTO MOTION)

While Plaintiff was waiting for a Response back from,(THE Motion to RECUSE) U.S. 9th
Appeal (En Banc), (EXHIBIT I) the Time Ran out for a Case Appeal. Rule 35 did not
 have accompanying in front of the Rule 35 . the Caption REFLECTING “45 Sec 681.10,”
 in front to make Plaintiff Recognize that there would be no MOTION TO REDRESS
ACCEPTED. Pursuant to 45 Sec. 681.10(g). Plaintiff Moves The Honorable U.S. 8th

(DISTRICT Court To Consider This Paragraph As A MOTION TO REOPEN Pursuant to
with EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES 45 Sec. 681.10(F). What the 9th District
Court System has filed (Mandated) now, is with out Court CLERK 'S Certification, and
Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction. Plaintiff's reason for not Repetitioning the U.S. 9th
D.C., is The Respondent JGZ Court has Such a Predominate Force Over the Tucson
Site (to Aid The Defaulted Defendants) that , Such Attempted Record Proper Redress
Motion (45 Sec. 681.10(F)) would not Survive Her Overt Appearance of Bias 28
U.S.C.A, 455(A) . PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT A., B.)

FEDERAL QUESTION

1. 1. 4th Amendment, 45 CF Sec. 681.10 (d) (Deprivation of Defaulted Case); 2.
5th Amendment, (FSIA) ,(Invasion of Foreign Property); *3. 6th Amendment, 28
U.S.C.A. Sec. 1331 (Bias Jury); *4. FSIA SUBJECT Matter Jurisdiction.

PROBABLE CAUSE

2. This Case Counts is not to determined the Ownership of the Federal Mining
Leases, But, to gain the Defaulted Case Part Pursuant to 45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d); that has
been Hi-Jacked In violation of 6th Amendment (Private Property) by IGZ
Court. With in this Defendant Defaulted Case the original Complaint is for the U. S.
Marshal Service Protection to Vacate Defendants's Criminal Trespass; The Court's
Remedies for Compensation for the Losses caused by the Defendants State; Defendant
County ; Defendant City ;and Defendant Federal Department (BLM).

HISTORY

3. Pursuant to Courts Ruling , U. S. 10th District Court, CV-98-0140 JC/RLP ; and U. S. 10th Appeals Court, the Plaintiffs is the **Legal Holders** of the **Federal LEASE Contracts** to the Mining Property. **PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT C).** BUT, Defendants refuse to Vacate (EXHIBIT G),(EXHIBIT F) . When carried to Court the U. S. 10th District Disposition that the Plaintiff had the Mining Leases if he had Filed Papers on file.

4.. U.S. 10th District refuse to acknowledge U.S. Vs, Belmont Bank,301 U.S. 324(1937), there is no use filing FOREIGN RELATIONS CASES in a Violating 6th Amendment , Bias U.S. 10th District Court. They were Challeng , but refuse to Redress Constitutionally. Yet, the County Defendants/ Attorney attempts to play fraud on unsuspecting Courts. To Block Plaintiff from returning with a Eviction Complaint.

5. SO, IN THE PRESENT CASE, this is also A FOREIGN RELATIONS CASE ,In this PRESENT CASE Subject Matter(4:19-CV-00159-JGZ), (WRIT OF MANDAMUS to recuse Justice) the Appeals Court Refused to Vote; the Plaintiff come to 8th District Court to gain form the U.S. Contracting Government Property Patents. Plaintiff's Mining Property Patent Rights that (U.S. 9th District Justice has by uncertified Court Subject Mattered Jurisdictioned Hi-Jacked) , has been held Hostage in Violation of Sixth Amendment . Defendant has Defaulted (Count *1. Document No. 29; and Count *2. Document 38.) by failing to Timely Answer the Court's Summons, 45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d).

STATEMENTS OF FIRST COUNT FACT

1. The Plaintiff's /Government is a Member investor with interest in (GOLD MINING) this U. S. ; Foreign Mining Contract; In the Past, He Single Handed attempted to Solve this Vacate Subject WITH GOOD FAITH , But ,due to the Misconduct of the Judicial Respondents. , System, The Problem Remains, So, This is 2 Recovery Writ: When Respondent JGZ had the case under ARTICLE III, SEC.2. and chosed to attempt to insert a Uncertified Court Clerk, 28U.S.C.A. Sec. 1331, Subject Matter Jurisdiction. she Chose to Withhold Justice granted by (FSIA). Re-Raising the Defaulted Defendants with out a Subject Matter Jurisdiction Counter Claim , all the time stating that she has no Jurisdiction.

A. In these 2 Cases Conspiracy Complaint PLEASE SEE: The Oldest One, Count 1., (EXHIBIT A), 17-CV-148-TUC-JGZ, Document No. 29., PAGE 5., LINES No. 17., 23. (WHERE Defendant B.L.M. failed to Timely ANSWER the Summons). The Respondent JGZ Attempting to Suaponte with a Fictitiously Counter Claim, to cure the Defendant 's Defaulted (45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d)) by raising them Up Again; with: receiving Fictitiously Mandating, to holding A Forbidden counter-claim Action (that has No new Court's Filing Record) in Bad Faith .

B. At the same time, Denying the Plaintiff's Patents Documents. Respondent JGZ Court failed to file a Re-opening Motion by Caption ,nor Petition ,45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (F)

1 **Record Proper Caption** where the Defendants have MOTIONED to reopen the case ,45 Sec.
2 681.10(F).

3 C. Respondent JGZ Court Statements after the Default has **No Court Clerk Certified**
4 **Standings..** Plaintiff has not found any Record Proper that Defendant has Filed A NOTICE OF
5 APPEAL , 45 Sec. 681.10 (I). The **Defendant's Default Silence is a Failure to make a Statement**
6 **up on which relief could be granted.** Plaintiff Petitioning **WRIT** for a Case Release is Justified.
7 Technically, This case is yet open.

8 **D.. That Defendant's Default Activated The Complaint Suit Request for INTERNATIONAL**
9 **TRADE ZONE Status. The Defendants Damaged Mining When they Criminally Invaded.**
10 **The Plaintiff also Complained By a Petition to the** District Court for **U.S. Marshal** for Service to
11 Vacate the Defendants. The Complaint was pushed aside. The ReRaised Default Defendant is
12 without showing of any
13 Jurisdiction being approved for Reopining after " ALG" approval.

14 **ISSUES OF SECOND COUNT**

15 **1. The Case officially ended for Defendants at Default, PLEASE SEE: SECOND CASE (19-**
16 **CV-00159-JGZ), (EXHIBIT B) , DOCUMENT No. 38), showing Respondent JGZ Judge**
17 **attempt SUAPONTE interfere and attempts to Cure their Failure to Timely Answer the**
18 **Summons 45 Sec. 681.10 (d). Second Case Officially ended, '**

19 -----
20 ***2. Court's SuasponTE is not Court Rules ,nor Court mandate; such requires compliance With**
21 **U.S. LOGAN ACT. Such SuasponTE is Persona not Court Rules , SEE: Doc. No. 38., Page 2.,**
22 **Lines 2., 3., 3.,4. & Page 3. line 2.,3. &page 6.,lines 25.,26.,27., 28. . all litigation stopped at**
23 **DEFAULT, there is no Court reflecting RECORD PROPER TO Certifie SUASPONTE.**
24

(6)

1 **ISSUES OF THE SECOND COUNT**

2 **Respondent JGZ Judge attempt SUAPONTE interfere and attempts to Cure their**
3 **Failure to Timely Answer the Summons 45 Sec. 681.10 (d). Second Case Officially**
4 **ended, the Defendants Luna County became Defaulted , 45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d), But, was**
5 **Attempted Protected by the Respondent JGZ Court's Fraudulent , Fictitiously Political**
6 **Counter-Claim. Raising the Federal Question of Double Jeopardy , 5th Amendment Due**
7 **Process.**

8 2. **ISSUES A Baseless SUAPONTE Attempted BILL OF ATTAINDER by U. S. 9th**
9 **District Court JGZ. Had it been Mandated, it have violated the U. S. FSIA Code; it**
10 **was not Certified. Document No. 38. (created after the Default) should be Denied by the**
11 **Court , For Lack of Presenting Subject Matter Jurisdiction Attached.**

12 A. **ISSUES, Suaponte Fraudulent Matter by Respondent JGZ. Violations the**
13 **Plaintiff's 6th Amendment : Rights to Impartial Jury. A unethical Act against "FSIA" , a**
14 **Bias Attempt to Politically Aid (EXHIBIT B) , a minder tnat one of the Defaulted**
15 **Defendants is a Federal Party, in violation of U. S. Vs, Belmont Bank, 301 U. S.**
16 **324(1937). Opinion of J. Sutherland...When it Comes to our**
17 **Foreign Relations the STATE does not exist.**

18
19 **B. ISSUES, Defaulted Defendant have not made a Statement up on which Relief could be**
20 **granted; Nor that would give Leave to reopen , 45 Sec. 681.10 (F) the Closed Defaulted**
21 **Matter. Respondent JGZ Court may not act as The Defense Counsel ;and Judge Both ,28**
22 **U.S.C.A. 455(A) Appearance of Bias., Misrepresent the Record Proper.**

1 ISSUES OF THE CASE

2 To avoid looking Bias the Respondent JGZ should have held her PREMATURE Suaponte
3 statements, **Document No. 38** . until one of the Defaulted Defendants made a **Motion** (45CFR
4 Sec. 681.10 (F). to Reopen. As it stands, the Respondent's attempted Rush to Judgment is
5 Premature, has no foundation offered by the Defaulted Defendants FOR Probable Cause.

6 C. ISSUES, The Plaintiff's **Notice of Default** is clearly (EXHIBITED) by the Respondents
7 JGZ attempted to ReRase , Cure Defendants. There is no final Record Filing until those
8 Motions are Answered. All Statements made after the Default is not applicable to this case.
9 **Filing of the Writ to remove the Default from under the Respondent is a recovery of**
10 **Plaintiff's 4 th Amendments (Unreasonable Seizure).**

11 **D. ISSUES, the Case is Closed before the Respondent Attempted to Suaponte**
12 **Document No. 38 is Moot, and should not be allowed to stand as a Certified Statement.**
13 **Plaintiff has no more arguments to apply to the Defaulted Defendants. This Attack is to**
14 **remove what Respondent JGZ has no right to (THE VICTORY OF THE CASE).**

3.. ISSUES, Plaintiff's Mining Patent Deeds **Real Property Federal Mining Lease**
are Being Held Hostage by **Respondent JGZ**. The Status of Action held by
Respondent **JGZ** is a **Suaponte** Forbidden Political Counter-Claims. **It has no**
Defendant Party Foundation Support FROM A Certified Court Clerk Case
Caption. It was made just to wast the Courts's Time; and Money of the Plaintiff.
(8)

1 **A. ISSUES,** The insistent attempt to saddle the Plaintiff with a Counter -Claim
2 (Filings Restrictions) Fraud is yet being attempted by JGZ Court. Even though, the U.
3 S. 9th Appeals has Removed the Counter-Claim Fraud, the Respondent attempts to hide
4 behind it. Because this Suaponte By JGZ is Not Certified, The Writ is Suficed.

4. ISSUES, Plaintiff had asking for US. Marshall Service; Courts Remedies for compensation for Losses. So, (in second case, CV-19-00159-TUC-JGZ, On the Date 04/09/2019 The Plaintiff Served a Summons on the Defendants with there Due Date being on the 4/30/2019 , But , Except the Case having a Federal Defendant Party , the Due Date for Him being 5/16/2019. The None-Federal Defendants and the Other Defendants All Came Late (45 CFR Sec. 681 .10(d))and Untimely to Answer the Summons issued by the Court Clerk. Respondent JGZ has attempted to make "Fraud" on the Defeult so as to Claim No Personal Jurisdiction ,Thus,to push aside the Foreign State Immunity Act (FSIA) , 14th Amendment Rights to the Case worked for.

FACT OF THE CASE

1. **Respondent is so aggressive that it makes returning to apply this Writs-**

there (Tucson) would be another Prejudice Rush to Take Over By Respondent JGZ. Hense, The U.S. 8th District Court is Petitioned. JGZ has a History of Case Invasion. She Just aggravates to the Point that a FSIA Case is Needed to answer the Federal Question. She do not understand her impact on International Relations. JGZ'S Suaponted Fraud are Overt Bias insult, Out side of Court

FACT OF THE CASE

Mandate. So much so, that the Plaintiff GLOBAL SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE UNION HAS BECAME CONCERNED: American Air Bases in North Africa is now

Cause to come under review by the Unions observing Pursuant to the Attitude by Respondant JGZ Court. This Matter Rases by infrence Questions that the New Global (it 10 years old) Court May be Petition to on behalf of it's Citizen ,Members, Plaintiff's Royal Nubian Sudan Government is al so a Member. The Federal Question there is ,CAN the Global Union Members FIND Judicial Justice, at U.S. State side ? or is Respondent JGZ Acts a Reflection of Real foreign U.S. Morality?

U.S. Courts are to have no Political Mandate. It's Appears that Respondent JGZ has fallow en of the wagon 28 U.S.c.a. 455(A) Bias.

1 2. **THE Respondent JGZCOURT** Interfered in the beginning by wrongful
2 Invasion **Prematurely with Double Jeopardy (then Magistrate had the Case, no**
3 **answer to recuse Motion had came yet)**, (U.S. 9th Appeals court is the only ReRaiser 45**CFR**
4 Sec. 681.10 (i)).

5 2,(A). Now ATTEMPTS TO RE-RAISED THE DEFAULT Defendants **WITH OUT**
6 Filing a Motion to **Re-Open, 45 CFR**Sec. 681. 10 (F). The Court do not reflect any
7 **New Filing to Re-Open the Case . Such a Case is Certified, and cannot be Mandate**
8 **in JIG'S Spontaneous Favor to hold a uncompleted Case. The Writ Cures the**
9 **Miscarriage of Justice.**

 3. The Re -Raised Default Defendants are **in Name Only as Re Raised. There**
is No Subject Matter Jurisdiction Attached to the Attempted Re Raising to allow it

FACT OF THE CASE

to stand. Thus, failing to make a statement up on which relief could be granted.

Plaintiffs Lease Contract investment being a **Foreign Government Relations (Matter , is not subjected** to the **Doctrine of EMINENT Domain.** **Respondent** JGZ Court Created Suaponte is a **Doctrine of Deprivation** of the **14 th Amendment, Section 5 , A Federal Question** **BILLOF ATTAINMENT to allow Defendant to Attemp to Criminally Deprive by EMINENT DOMAIN** the Plaintiff's **Federal Contracted Property.** Document No. 38; Document No. 29 are **Moot uncertified Acts.**

1 **3.** **Respondent JGZ** Acted on her own to Create a Wrongful Depriving (two
2 **Times)** Disposition **,with out any Defaulted Defendants** placing any **Subject Matter**
3 **Jurisdiction (28 U.S.C.A. 1331)** to the Case **being eligible to file Legally Respected**
4 **Documents . Thus,** Violating the Plaintiff's **6th Amendment Rights** to his Property.

5 4. Defendant Luna County's Default Ended their Legal Filing Status, and All
6 Attempted Documents **Filing After the Default has No Record Reflecting** Where they Filed
7 With the **Court Clerk** for a **New Certified** Cause ;and Any Attempte to Claim Defendants a
8 Jurisdiction is Moot; SEE:, **U. S. 301 U. S. BELMONT BANK , 324(1937)...OPINION**
9 **OF J. SUTHERLAND...**When it Comes to our foreign Relations the **STATE Does not exist.**
10 **Thus,** There is no **State LINE Districts , Nor STATE Venue, AND NO 11TH** Amendment
11 state Immunity in **Federal Court Pursuant to "FSIA Cases.**

13 *1. Unnecessary Arguments a uncertified Case filing goes to the Credit of judicial Morality
14 Doctrine. Courts causing imposing such are malicjous. All Litigation such ends at Default.

ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE

1. The Default Triggered the granting of the **International Trade Zone Rights**. The **Plaintiff's International Trade Zone** FROM THE First Case Complaint , Was also Repeated in the **Second Count** for a Second Time, and Won By Defendant“Default’s Status. _

A. **All** the Defendants (Documents # 38) show a **Bogus Position Attempted Spontaneous** is Without **Clerk’s Certification**, 28U.S.C,A,455(B),(1) **DISQUALIFIES RULE. All attempt to Legal interning Re-Raising Defendants** in to the Case after the Default is a **Political Forbidden Counter-Claim, Bias Action against (FSIA) Code(7/19/2019). (FSIA) Confers Personal JURISDICTION ON COURTS, IF ITS REQUIREMENTS ARE MET. Respondent JG Z AT Present, Is attacking the Constitutional Protected Rights Of the Plaintiff to Do Business with the US. Government. Respondent JGZ hold no Political Raised Mandate Jurisdiction , Her Refusal to Redress Shows Bias.**

B. The BIM Defendants Never did do their Mandate to grant the Plaintiff His Paten.

C. The Attempt is a **Fictitious Political Counter -Claim violating (FSIA); the Court’s Mandate. Such Political Mandate is** Wrongly holding the **Plaintiff’s Rights** to **The 14th Amendment Section 5.** DUE Process Granted, **SEE: U.S. 10th District Court, (EXHIBIT C), Page 3. Parqagraph 1. . Respondent JGZ Filed Criminal Extra-Territorial**

1 **ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE**

2 **Invasion** has no Legal Right to Attempt to Eminent Domain. The Default Rights created,
3 **the New International Trade Zone.** Such are classed as same as **Corporations Status;**
4 **City; as Persons ; in this case Foreign EMBASSY STATUS;** the **Writ of Habeas Corpus**
5 is placed for its Release. U.S. have no Morial Right to Object,"BLM" allowed trusspass.

6 **C. Defendant Luna County had DUTY to Protect** the Plaintiff's Interest in the Mining
7 Lease Matter pursuant to a). Each Year the Plaintiff Paid the Required Assessment to the
8 Defendant Luna County. **U. S. Mining Act of 1872..** The Defendant **instead of given**
9 Protection plaintiff's Enterprise of Mining , the Defendant sat out to **Violate their Mandate**
10 with Attempted **CRIMINAL EXTRA TERRITORIAL INVASION.** This violated the
11 Plaintiff's **4 Amendment (unreasonable seizure)** . The Defendant JGZ Holding Plaintiff's
12 Property Deeds are **Acts of Forbidden invasions by Counter-Claim** in **Foreign Relations**
13 **Cases.**

14
15 D. Defendants often used the Claim of Plaintiff Restrictions to Block Returning to
16 **(1937) Opinion of J. SUTHERLAND....The executives has the sole right to represent his**
17 **Government;**

18
19 E. Plaintiffs has won some Two Times already, However, Plaintiffs Need for U. S.
20 Marshal's Service is yet unanswered. Defendant BLM Mandate WAS to instruct the

ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE

E. The Respondent **JGZ attempt** to Give the **Defendants State advantages** in a **ARTICLE III**, Section 2. Discrepancy Wrongfully; They suffers from the **Doctrine of None-Delegation** ,. This means that the Attempted observance of **State Jurisdiction** , State **District** , and **State Venue** Claims **has no weight** ; **Not even**, before, nor After the Defendants had became Defaulted.

G. What The **Plaintiffs** and the **U.S Government Trade Agreements** has. and Federal Mining Leases that the **U. S. Government h Corp** ad with the **Plaintiff/Government** ,is **not subject to State Right** to interfere , Even with the Help of the Respondent JGZ Court to BILL ATTANDER Act of EMINENT **DOMAIN,SEE: U. S. Vs. CUSTISS. 299 U. S. 304 (1936)..** Opinion of J. Sutherland.. the State has no Status In Foreign Contracts,,,

2 About Case 17-CV-00149-JGZ / FSIA

, Respondent JGZ willfully over looked The District COURTS CLERKS RULES: TO Create a needless FEDERAL QUESTION Case. The Respondent JGZ Court has a right to Suapone, **Brook, Vs, Cosumnes River Land LLC, No. 2:19-cv-02533-MCE-AC,** 2020 WL 2062182, AT *1 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2020), But. IT CAN NOT BE AN ATTEMPT TO bill of attainment: nor CAN The suaponte Re-Rase a Party unless a Motion **is ask for 45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (F).** The first step is to File a Action in District Court Clerks Office. The **Document No. 38** . did not comply to Court RE-

1 ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE.

2 OPENING RULE, Nor observe Constitutional ARTICLE I, Section 10., Reprisals.

3 A. when the Court Clerk issue a Summons to be served, is when a case has a legal CASE
4 Number . The After Default Respondent JG Ruling Reason for Dismissing the
5 Conspiracy Complaint has Grounds. To Save the **Government** the Defendant
6 Attempted to not have (ASIA) Subject Matter Jurisdiction to sat the Case on Federal Question,
7 Attempting to Playing Fraud on the Plaintiff.

8 B. . In Both COUNTS , IN (CV-19-00159-JGZ)in particular , each Case at the Point of
9 Defendants Default , 45 cfr Sec. 681.10 (d) the Case Ended. Yet, All attempt to File
10 Documents after that date ,they are Foreign Document (not Certified); that is not to be
11 Counted as a legal Defense in the Case that Defendant failed to participate in .
12 DOCUMENT No. 38. (EXHIBIT B) IS A Attempted TO Fictitiously DO A BILL OF
13 ATTAINDER. Document No. 38 attempt to by pass the Court Clerk's Filing. From the
14 time of the Default, this Defendants State has attempted to file Political Documents . U.S.
15 Courts Mandate do not allow Court's Political Made Mandates. Counter Claim are
16 Forbidden in Foreign Relations Cases, It Violates the U. S. Foreign Agent Act.

17
18 C. Criminal Extra Territorial Invasion to Attempt Eminent Domain is Criminal ; and
19 The attack is International Terrorism in Foreign Relations All Federal Courts have Jurisdiction
20 . When it is a violating and a Foreign Minister its a ARTICLE III. Section 2. Matter (FSIA).
21 D . The Record (CV-17-00149 -JG) Shows that after Defendants Defaulted , the
22 Respondent JGZ Court attempted give Disposition Contrary to the reflected **Record Proper.**

1 **ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE**

2 Thus. Violating Plaintiff Rights[allowing the Defaulted Defendant another chance to attempt
3 **Eminent Domain** , Criminal Trespass.

4 E, , There was no **Personal Jurisdiction Questioning** presented against the Court's
5 Personal Jurisdiction (FSIA). From the Time that Defendants Default the Property has
6 received WHAT THE Complaint Petition ask for a **INTERNATIONAL TRADE ZONE**
7 **STATUS**. Respondent **JGZ** attempted to create conflict **VIA Suaponte** to aid a Criminal
8 Trespass to attempted **Eminet DOMAIN**. Due to Damages by Defendants
9 the X-Federal Mining Leases is now Offically Schedule to Be a INTERNATIONAL TRADE
10 ZONE / EMBASSY ,Won by the Defendants Default.

11
12 F. The Defendants JGZ 149(CV-17-00149-JGZ) Statements of her requirements HAD
13 NO JURISDICTION THE First Amendment, that Plaintiff should abandon His **First**
14 **Amendment** Complaint, Respondent JGZ claim to not be able to Jurisdiction (FSIA) a
15 **FIRST AMENDMENT** IS Fraud. No Defendant State has made a legally Question Personal
16 Jurisdiction in a FSIA Subject Matter Jurisdiction; Respondent JGZ played Fraud on
17 Attempting to Re-Raising Magistrate. Whom has not answered **45 Sec. 681.10 (i),CFR** ,

18 .G. **THE DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO Attempt to Eminet Domain Property**
19 **that not Even the Federal Defendant has under it's Jurisdiction.** Defendants At Point of
20 Default , ACTIVATED THE COMPLAINTS PLEADINGS. So, Another one OF THE
21 Complaint, Pleadings is that the Property become a **INTERNATIONAL TRADE ZONE;**
22 (16)

THIS IS why this Writ is bein by 19-CV-00159-TUC-JGZ; CV-17-00149-JGZ

h. Respondent JGZ attempted to Do a Bill OF ATTANDER, By Raising up again the Defaulted Defendants to allow Criminal Extra Territorial Invasion . Even, Admitts that the Defaulted Defendants had to be raised up again. Totally over looking that the Case had ended Legally for the Defendants State. The Defendants failed to state a Claim up on which relief could be granted. **RESPONDENT JGZ** Court is holding this Due Process **Case Hostage Politically. ; Respondent JGZ Court** Attempted Re-Raised Defaulte_Defendant **in name only. See: Count 2. :Document No. 38 ; and Count 1. :Document No. 29.** Has no Subject Matter Jurisdiction Attached.

CONCLUSIONS

By Defendant failing to timely answer the Original Summons , any following Documents Filings should have been through the Court Clerks ,or Appeal Court's Approval,or AS A New filing Process. To continue to pursue Filing in the Original Case ,was a Moot Cause, 45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d). ;INTERNATIONAL TRADE ZONE, that came with the Defendants Default; There is **no Record Proper of Defendants Petition to Re-opening the Case (45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (f),** for which Defendant **JGZ Court** is attempting **Rush to Mandat ;** The Defendant Deming City has Before Defaulting, deprived the Plaintiff Embassy of Utility Services **(water)** Rights as a Reprisals. SEE: **(EXHIBIT P) (EXHIBIT Q), (EXHIBIT R).** Plaintiff Has Paid All The Bill. They Defaulted, and should suffer the Writ. ;The WRIT IS JUSTIFIED (FSIA), Respondent JGZ is holding NO Legal Position. Document No. 38, The Record Proper do not reflect any Clerk **Case New Filed** Petition (45 CFR Sec. 681.10(F))for the Count 2.:Document No. 38 . ;Nor in First Count: Case Document No. 29.

1 CONCLUSIONS

2 It There is no Subject Matter Jurisdiction Attached called attempted Reprisals, ()

3 MALICIOUS litigation. Its not apart of any Original Defendants Legal Protest.

4 Document No. 38. and Documents No. 27. are a violation of ARTICLE 1., Section 10.

5 Reprisals Respondent JGZ's Statements Presented are Foreign, and is without Legal

6 Status; The Filings are Considered foreign , uncertified , AND NO One in the U.S. Court

7 System is Allowed to Litigate A Political Subject Matter ; ARTICLE III., Section 2. ,has

8 ended in Default (45 CFR Sec. 681.10 (d). The Document No. 38. is a Attempted Court

9 Bias Counter Claim Violation of the 6th Amendment , and IS Attempting TO Court over

10 ride U.S. Vs, Belmart Bank, 301. , And the Foreign State Immunity Act Jurisdiction

11 (FSIA), Attempting to sit on a International Trade Zone is a Bias Criminal Action of

12 Political Status. The Release of the Default Case to Plaintiff would be consistent with

13 Justice and Right, or whot Ever the Honorable think is Right Constitutionly. The Rights

14 to have the U.S. 10th District Court Ruled Contracted Property in Plaintiff's Possession is

15 Law; and Right to have U.S. Marshal Service to Protect the Plaintiff Is Justified by the

16 WRIT's SERVICE. Respondent JGZ actions Violated Plaintiff Rights to the Constitutions

17 Protection. The Defaulted Defendants Should be Evicted from the Federal Property, A

18 Patten is due the Plaintiff. U.S. 10 District Court's Ruling should be Up held by the

19 WRIT.

20 Thus , having no more Business before the Honorable..

21 Plaintiff thank the Court.

22 4/1 /2021

23 Mis Majesty LORD PUNCHALL EXECUTIVE SU'I JU'RE

24 ROYAL NUBIAN SUDAN GOVERNMENT EMBASST # 15

25 702 WEST FIRST STREET

26 DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

27 (575) 694-4385/punchardwilliamlord@gmail.com

28 I certify that I have mailed a Copy to all Defendants on Date 4/01/2021

29 Lord Punchall EXECUTIVE SU'I JU'RE

LORD PUNCHALL